

JAN 8 1926

The Classical Weekly

GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIX, No. 10

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1926

WHOLE NO. 513

Special Offers

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

I. Back Volumes:

- (a) Volumes 1-6, **unbound**, at \$1.00 each;
- (b) Volumes 16-18, **unbound**, at \$1.50 each;
- (c) Complete sets, 18 volumes, **unbound**, at \$24.00.

Note: Volumes 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 can not be sold separately.

II. General Index to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, Volumes I-XVI, and Index to Volume XVII, bound together, in cloth (112 pages), \$2.25.

IMPORTANT

Remittances must accompany orders. The prices given above are offered only to those who have paid dues for the current year of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States (October 1, 1925-April 30, 1926).

Send Orders, With Remittances,

to

CHARLES KNAPP, 1737 Sedgwick Ave., N. Y. City

They Meet the New Requirements In Latin

Harkness, Kirtland and Williams' Cicero's Nine Orations and Impeachment of Verres

Including the First Oration against Catiline, the Oration for Archias and the newly prescribed **Plunder of Syracuse**... \$1.72

Gleason's A Term of Ovid, Revised

Including these required selections from the **Metamorphoses**: **Deucalion and Pyrrha, Phaethon, The Golden Fleece, Philemon and Baucis, and Atalanta's Race**..... \$1.12

Cicero's Impeachment of Verres (Wightman)

Providing in pamphlet form this new requirement not generally found in school editions of Cicero's Orations \$0.16

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA



Roman Children at play. From D'Ooge's *Elements of Latin*

D'OOGHE'S ELEMENTS OF LATIN

In accordance with the suggestions of the Classical Investigation, D'Ooge's *Elements of Latin* offers plenty of easy Latin; a thorough treatment of derivatives; a constant correlation of English grammar and Latin grammar; an abundance of well-chosen illustrations, stories, fables, and much more to interest the student in Roman life and thought.

Catalogue price \$1.32 subject to the usual discount

BOSTON

CHICAGO

GINN AND COMPANY

ATLANTA

DALLAS

COLUMBUS

NEW YORK

SAN FRANCISCO

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XIX, NO. 10

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 1926

WHOLE NO. 513

SOME PHASES OF THE GENERAL REPORT OF THE CLASSICAL INVESTIGATION¹

It is with some hesitation that I undertake to read a paper which will direct attention to possible defects in a document of many excellent features. The Classical Investigation of the American Classical League in its way was carried out energetically and thoroughly. No one, I think, will deny that. Many data were gathered from all parts of the country in an effort to obtain conclusions and formulate recommendations as widely applicable as possible. It was no mere local investigation, but a nation-wide survey. The method of the Investigation, i. e. the nature of the material and the manner of its treatment, has caused some irritation among classicists of note, but the fact remains that both the nature of the data and the method of its treatment have received the general approval of authoritative opinion in the special fields of education, experimental psychology, and statistics. Furthermore, since the publication of the General Report², no dissenting word has been heard from the classical world itself. No one has ventured even to suggest that certain recommendations be accepted with caution³.

The Report, however, would scarcely be a human document, if it could not be improved in one respect or another. As a matter of fact, scattered throughout it are remarks and recommendations which, though possibly of minor importance to some, deserve in my opinion serious study. Furthermore, one or two matters strike me as grave omissions, perhaps grave enough for special investigation. With such matters, then, will the present paper deal.

On page 29 we read, "... There has been little criticism or complaint regarding the teaching of Greek and consequently little need for an examination of that subject". However I try to understand that statement; it falls little short of an absurdity. For the most part, wherever Greek is taught in our High Schools, the teacher of Latin does the work, and no appreciable difference exists in the approach to either language. If, then, the teaching of Latin is in need of much adjustment and revision, the same holds for the teaching of Greek, unless we are willing to say that what is faulty in the one is good in the other. It

may be said that the content of the Greek course is better suited for the purposes of the High School curriculum and better distributed, but the method of teaching that content is in general not at all superior. The entire question of the teaching of Greek needs special attention; present conditions show that Greek needs such attention more than Latin requires it. Surely Greek is in a bad way, when only 11,000 pupils in all the Schools of the country are studying it. An investigation like that for Latin, which would first of all show the values of the study of Greek and then indicate how these values might be obtained best, is the greatest hope for a renaissance of Greek studies. Perhaps there existed good reasons for not including Greek in the investigation of Latin, but certainly no satisfactory reason appears in the General Report. For the present, Greek seems to have been sidetracked because of the hopeless nature of its case and the consequently unjustifiable trouble and expense incident to a thorough survey of it.

No mention is made in the Report of the teaching of any of the tropes and figures of speech. Someone has remarked that the most serious omission in the teaching of Latin in the United States to-day is the almost universal neglect of even the most important stylistic decorations. A Roman could measure an author's style as it were by a rule. Almost every conceivable sort of expression could be classified as a trope or a figure, a thorough mastery of which was the chief element in a Roman's training to speak or write. Surely it would give all of us a better appreciation of the content and style of a Latin author if we could judge his work by the standards which he himself had in mind as he constructed it. Furthermore, whether consciously or not, writers of English have assimilated many of these stylistic features into their own works, and thus through the tropes and figures a tangible and efficient means may be had for comparing the style of a Latin author with that of an English author. Studies of this kind would aid greatly in attaining the historical and cultural values mentioned in the Report, as well as in increasing the beneficial effect of the study of Latin on mastery of English. It was very gratifying to read in the Report of the Syllabus Committee of The New York Classical Club, printed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.49 (November 10, 1924), "We desire more stress than heretofore laid on style and structure with a prescription of certain rhetorical terms to be treated during the recitation".

¹This paper was read at the Sixth Annual Fall Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at The George Washington University, Washington, D. C., November 29, 1924.

²The full title of the Report to which Professor Deferrari refers runs as follows: The Classical Investigation Conducted by The Advisory Committee of the American Classical League. Part One, General Report: A Summary of Results With Recommendations for the Organization of the Course in Secondary Latin and for Improvement in Methods of Teaching. Princeton University Press (1924). Pp. viii + 305.

³Professor Deferrari had overlooked certain published expressions of this sort.

It is regrettable also that the question of the method of pronouncing Latin did not receive more consideration, and that the reasons for adopting the Roman pronunciation were not presented in the Report.

Even the simple statement in an official way that all our Public Schools use the Roman pronunciation would have been welcomed by many of our fellow Latinists in Europe, where in some quarters the Roman pronunciation is not universally used even by State Schools. Furthermore, many teachers in our own country, almost entirely from Private Schools, however, are still quoting the anomalous position of the late Professor Bennett against the adoption of the Roman pronunciation, and they regulate their own policy accordingly. An official pronouncement as to the prevalent usage would have been a boon to the few in these private institutions who are trying to overcome a spirit of ultrconservatism and actual hostility to the Roman pronunciation. The statement on page 191 of the Report, "It is assumed that the Roman method of pronunciation will be employed in the reading of Latin", is not sufficient for the present situation.

In all its specific recommendations the Report very wisely speaks of nothing but classical Latin. However, on page 164 we read that "The Adams study shows that of 190 colleges giving specific information with reference to their actual practice in the administration of entrance requirements . . . 19% allow substitutions of non-classical Latin for a part of the classical Latin included in the standard course. . . ." Also, on pages 192-193, in the chapter on Methods of Teaching Secondary Latin, in a discussion of the use of Oral Latin, we read:

... We may even go a step farther on occasions when phrases of Law Latin or Church Latin well express the thought and may use them whether or not they conform closely to accepted canons of spoken Latin. Here as everywhere living directness is better than inanimate precision. Flat barbarisms are of course to be avoided. Yet Latin in daily talk need not be Ciceronian to be correct. Erasmus, a master in style, is a fine instance of this, and we need not hesitate to follow his lead in using Latin as a living language. Late Latin, pagan, patristic, medieval and modern, is rich in good as well as in poor material. The good material should be selected and used. It will do much to give variety. It will do more in giving young students the beginnings of an insight into the long unbroken continuity of Latin, its adaptability for expressing modern ideas and its immense place and influence in human history.

This universal outlook on the Latin language and literature is indeed to be commended, not only because of its importance for a better understanding of Latin culture, but also as an eloquent proof of the close relationship of that culture with our own. Too many of our teachers still restrict themselves in their personal interests to the Golden Age of Latin literature, often with the bad effect of making themselves decidedly hostile to all Latin not of that period. Strangely enough, however, the opposite view, equally extreme, has been accepted by many of late, and the suggestions of the Investigators seem likely to add to their number. They read the Latin of all periods as their interests direct, but usually they do not possess a sufficiently exact knowledge of Latin to enable them to appreciate adequately the various changes that have taken place in the growth of the language. In fact it is almost impossible for them, granted that they have the

necessary exact knowledge of classical Latin, to detect the many subtle linguistic changes that have arisen in the subsequent periods, unless they have made some special study of them. And here the added difficulty exists of the lack of any hand-book in English which will enable them to make this special study conveniently. The only work that treats of the Latin of the early centuries of our era is Grandgent's *Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (Heath, Boston, 1907: see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.60-62), and most of the Latin with which we are concerned is not, so to speak, vulgar Latin at all⁴. Already text-books of Patristic and late Latin have begun to appear from such extremists as I now mention, and they show little or no appreciation of the linguistic changes. In fact one of them utterly ignores such changes, and contains for notes much matter that, so far as the College student is concerned, is extraneous, and this in spite of the fact that the publishers speak of the notes as "unusually full, sane and helpful". The danger, of course, in this indiscriminate use of all kinds of Latin, granting that "flat barbarisms" are avoided, is the loss of accuracy in understanding and interpreting the Latin of all periods, and the development of a loose and individualistic knowledge of the language. The Latin of the Golden Age must be taken as the norm, for very obvious reasons, and to appreciate truly the thought and the content of later Latin we must have a knowledge of the changes which have occurred in the life of the Latin language since that time. This can be done even late in the High School course and be a source of great interest and value to the student, if it is carried out with a view to exhibiting the laws of the development of language and the philosophy of grammar.

My next point concerns the first of the ultimate objectives for the Secondary School course in Latin as arranged in the tentative list drawn up before the Investigation had actually begun. The attitude of one of the Investigators toward it was made known during the progress of the investigation, and much controversy grew up around it. I mean, "Ability to read new Latin after the study of the language in school or college has ceased" (compare the Report, 33). In the evaluation of the ultimate objectives (Report, 39), we read that

An analysis of the present enrolment and distribution of students of Latin in the secondary schools and colleges shows that 860 of every thousand pupils who begin the study of Latin in high school discontinue the subject at the end of one, two or three years, 90 at the end of four years, and that the remaining 50 continue the subject in college. A comparison of these facts with the percentages given above indicates that under present conditions two out of each of these three groups or a total of six of every 1,000 who begin the study of Latin in high school may be expected in any one year in after life to read some new Latin.

We are told also that in the General Questionnaire, in which teachers of Latin were asked to indicate which of the nineteen objectives listed they regarded as valid for the Secondary School course as a whole, this ob-

⁴A recent book by H. P. V. Nunn, *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin* (Cambridge University Press, 1922), is very inadequate.

jective received the smallest number of votes, only 39% indicating that they regarded this objective valid for the Secondary School course (40); and that in the Score Card in which teachers were asked to indicate their judgment as to the relative importance of these objectives, this objective was ranked lowest for the course as a whole (40). A little below we read (40), "... Of those teachers who regarded this objective as valid for the course as a whole 19% considered that the results secured in their own schools were satisfactory". Then the Investigators conclude (40), "In view of the evidence given above we believe that this objective is not valid for most pupils in the secondary course and it is therefore omitted from the list of ultimate objectives recommended".

In spite of all the evidence presented in the report I do not believe that the omission of this objective is justifiable. With reference to the fact that only six out of every 1,000 who begin the study of Latin in High School may be expected in any one year in after life to read some new Latin, it would be interesting to have similar statistics for the Modern Languages. I venture to say, that the statistics for Modern Languages would differ little from those presented here for Latin. Again, the fact that 39% of the teachers questioned rated this objective lowest for the course as a whole does not seem to me to be an argument for excluding it. The number of teachers who consider the results secured in their own Schools as satisfactory could be increased by the dissemination of proper directions for attaining this objective. Whether attainable to any noteworthy degree or not, this objective represents a natural and fundamentally sound attitude toward the study of every language, regardless of its difficulty. In the case of Latin, however, I believe that conditions are being greatly improved. The Investigation in this regard has merely disclosed the fact of a condition, but not a state of things which is to be accepted as inevitable.

Very naturally the greatest disagreements with the General Report arise in connection with the specific recommendations of the Investigators, especially those recommendations which, so far as I can ascertain, are the personal views of the Investigators, or at any rate not the results of a general survey of competent opinion. I shall select such remarks from the chapters on content (83-168) and method (169-235) as seem worthy of further consideration, and shall treat them approximately in the order of their appearance in the Report.

Among the General Recommendations (123-124) I object to the last part of Recommendation 5 (124), "That practice in writing Latin be continued throughout the first, second and third years. *It may well be omitted from the work of the fourth year in order to allow full time for the reading*". <The Italics are mine>. I have seen no arguments advanced in the Report which would induce me to recede from what you may call an old-fashioned view that practice in writing a language is the best preparation to reading its literature. The ability to write a foreign language is the

best index of the pupils' knowledge; in this alone there can be no 'bluff'. Let us profit by the experiences of the past. In the Reverend R. Schwickerath's work, *Jesuit Education*, 509-510 (St. Louis, 1903), we read:

It is known that, after the Berlin Conference of 1890, Latin lost fifteen hours a week in the nine classes of the gymnasium. The Latin compositions particularly were reduced considerably, almost completely abolished. What was the result? Very soon complaints were heard from all sides that in consequence of these changes the teaching of Latin had been greatly injured. It became evident that more extensive writing of Latin was necessary to obtain the linguistic and logical training of the mind, which is one of the foremost objects of Latin instruction. Only these exercises, the practical application of the rules of etymology and syntax, the careful examination of the peculiarities of style in the higher classes, and constant comparison with the mother-tongue, by means of translations and re-translations, give a thorough knowledge and insight into the language....

Experience soon forced the German authorities to revert to what had been thrown overboard. In 1895 permission was granted to add one hour weekly in the higher classes, which was to be devoted to practice in writing and to the application and repetition of rules of grammar and style. For, as Professor Fries declared, the curtailing of these exercises had proved to be the weakest point of the changes made after 1890. In the second conference, in 1900, the opinion of the most distinguished scholars was most positive in demanding a further strengthening of these exercises. It was proposed that a Latin composition should again be required for the last examination.

Thus, far from expecting in the General Report a recommendation for the curtailment of the amount of Latin composition accomplished at present in our High Schools, I looked for specific recommendations for the improvement of the work in Latin composition, and, possibly, for a suggestion that additional time be allotted to such work.

Another General Recommendation (1: page 123) involves the spreading of the elements of Latin, now usually studied in the first year, over the entire period of four years. I do not see how any work of real Latin can be approached intelligently without a rather comprehensive knowledge of both forms and syntax. This will be discussed at greater length, later, in another connection.

Other General Recommendations seem to overstress easy Latin and the use of 'made' Latin. If they should be followed completely, they would result in the High School pupils' having very little acquaintance with real Latin. No matter how much of a classical veneer modern Latin may have, it can not replace, for School purposes, the Latin masterpieces.

Recommendation 7 (124) urges greater freedom of choice for the Latin teachers in the selection of the authors read. The College Entrance Examination Board permits considerable freedom already, and I cannot see how much more can be allowed without, first, demoralizing the aim of Secondary School Latin (however well intentioned the School teacher may be), and, secondly, without encountering the very practical difficulty of procuring suitable text-books and not entailing prohibitive expense.

Professor Lodge, in *The Classical Journal* 20.78-79

(November, 1924), thinks that, on the basis of real worth, the majority of teachers will still prefer Caesar. He also lends his support (83) to the retention of the four Catilinarian Orations in preference to substituting for them any of Cicero's other orations. He says, "To one holding, as I do, that Cicero's great value is as the last defender and martyr of the Constitution, the inclusion of speeches that do not serve to interpret that attitude of his is a mistake".

In discussing the character of the "easy Latin" to be read (125-129), stress is placed on improving the quality of the English of the pupils' translation (126-127). If the pupil has had the proper training in the fundamentals of Latin, and sufficient practice in translating, the teacher will have little difficulty in maintaining a decent standard of English, provided of course the pupil has also had the proper previous training in the fundamentals of English. Much of the talk about poor English in the Latin classroom is 'barking up the wrong tree'. The main trouble lies with the earlier training in English. We can do something to make up for the lack of fundamental knowledge of English expression and composition, but we must not be expected to do a great deal.

On pages 138, 142, and 137 are given the results obtained from a wide application, at the end of the second semester, of the Godsey test in the syntax of the verb, the Pressey test in the syntax of the noun, the pronoun, and the adjective, and the Tyler-Pressey test in verb-forms. The generally poor results obtained are taken as conclusive proof that all the fundamentals of Latin should not be treated in the first year, as is usually done to-day. The publication of the "Documentary Evidence" will indicate perhaps how widely and where these tests were given. Again, we may have here an indication of faulty previous training in English. In any case, if the statistics given represent an actual state of affairs throughout the country, then surely a remedy must be found. I agree that the importance of the various parts of the grammar in understanding Latin alone should decide how soon we should introduce them in the Latin course. But by this same token I do not see how a teacher can neglect much of the current first year book before he introduces his pupils to real Latin. The admonition that the teaching of certain forms and principles may be postponed but need not be entirely ignored until they are formally taught does not remedy matters at all. If pupils do not learn such portions of the grammar now, in the regular first year course, when teachers are exerting all their efforts to that end, they certainly will profit little by an informal treatment of them. Accordingly, the distribution of the fundamentals of the grammar throughout the four year course as specifically recommended on pages 157-162 seems to me very unsound. We are to leave until the fifth and sixth semesters dative with adjectives, dative of agent, ablative of comparison, ablative of degree of difference, locative, subjunctive in a *cum*-clause of concession, subjunctive in a relative clause of description (characteristic), subjunctive in a substantive clause of fact with *ut*, passive periphrastic, and the

subjunctive in present and past conditions contrary to fact. In the seventh and eighth semesters we are to teach the genitive with adjectives, genitive with verbs of remembering and forgetting, genitive with impersonal verbs, double accusative with verbs of making, historical infinitive, subjunctive in wishes, and the subjunctive expressing possibility, obligation, etc.

Under these restrictions I do not see how students could be expected by themselves to prepare the translation of any real Latin before late in the sixth semester or third year. I can, indeed, understand how it could be undertaken earlier if done under the supervision of the teacher in class. Otherwise, however, I feel that beginners would develop very slovenly habits of translation, using their intuition much more than their powers of reason.

But let us examine the distribution of the forms in certain semesters. The imperative of all conjugations, present active second singular and plural, is to be learned in the first semester, but the pupil is *not* to study until the fourth semester the pronouns *aliquis* and *quisque*, the irregularities in the conjugation of *possum*, *eo*, *fero*, *volo*, *nolo*, and *malo*, deponent verbs of all conjugations, future passive participle (gerundive) of all conjugations, and the principal parts of selected verbs. In the fifth semester the pupil is to study locative case, future perfect indicative active and passive of all conjugations, the supine, and principal parts of selected verbs.

Once more the question arises, under such conditions what classical author can be studied by our classes before the latter part of the third year, except under the immediate supervision of the teacher? It may be true that few master these forms very early under the present manner of study, or at least that few master them well enough to pass certain tests, but the great majority of those who have any real ability to profit from an extended period of Latin study do acquire an early working knowledge of these forms, that is, a sufficiently accurate conception of the forms to enable them to acquire, by their own efforts, the exact information necessary.

I pass to a remark of less importance, on page 175:

It is probably not too much to say that the practice of depending solely or largely on the translation of a passage to test the pupil's preparation of the passage without giving him adequate assistance or training in preparation of the advance assignment is in large measure responsible for the frequent use of illegitimate helps in the study of Latin.

With this, too, I disagree. The use of the 'pony' in most cases results from a defective moral training over which the Latin class-room can have at most but slight control. Home influences, and other local environment, as well as an early acquisition of bad habits of study, have far more to do with the use of the 'pony' than the failure of the teacher 'to go over the new assignment'. In fact, I can name Schools where the regular practice is to go over carefully the entire translation for the next lesson, and I dare say that the use of illegitimate helps is as flagrant there as in any other School known to me. Again, the wide-spread use of

the 'pony' is no longer confined to pupils studying the ancient Classics. The teachers of Modern Languages also are having their troubles in this regard. Perhaps it is the spirit of the age!

We find a great deal said in the Report about English derivatives (210-213). My own experience with this phase of Latin teaching has been rather disappointing. I have found that English derivatives are very useful for fixing certain forms, but, unless they are restricted to the very obvious words, they tend to create confusion and discouragement. Correlating Latin with English has its value, of course, but it also can be carried too far in the matter of learning Latin. Here again I am glad to quote the report of the Syllabus Committee of The New York Classical Club (THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.40): "Throughout the course, less stress should be laid than at present on derivation work. This work, further, should be so directed as to be helpful to the student in his understanding of Latin rather than of his mother tongue".

Throughout the Report great stress is laid on outside reading in English. This emphasis seems timely because of the present tendency towards neglecting any sort of background for the authors read. It strikes me, however, that much of this reading could be arranged as prescribed work in the Departments of English and History. This would, first of all, assure that a sufficient amount of it would be done, and, in the second place, would save a little more time for real Latin.

In the recommendations for teaching vocabulary (206-210) one very important matter seems to have been neglected both by the Investigators and by the teachers investigated. In the sharp attack upon the pupil who turns immediately to his Vocabulary without a thought of the form he is to look for, no mention has been made of the proper use of a Vocabulary, or, better still, of the intelligent use of a Dictionary. "Associating a new Latin word with English derivatives or with related Latin words before the word is met in a sentence", and "Determining the meaning of a new Latin word from context, association with English derivatives or association with related Latin words as the new word is met in a sentence" (207) are all very well, but again only under the immediate supervision of the teacher. If a pupil who does not know how to check such processes by a careful use of the Vocabulary or the Dictionary seeks to employ them by himself alone, he will get only sorry results. Perception Cards, 'spell-downs' and the like are also useful to a certain extent, but, if they are carried very far, they will give pupils very mistaken notions of the meaning of some very common Latin words, because the habit is acquired thereby of giving a single meaning to all words, even such words as *fero*, *ratio*, *res*, *pars*, etc. I can not get away from the belief that the fundamental process in learning vocabulary is a knowledge of how to handle, first the Vocabulary at the back of the book, and then, before the end of the High School course, the Harpers' Latin Lexicon. All other methods are auxiliary to this.

As one reads the Report through, and meets the repeated admonitions to begin the reading of Latin early, and to teach the fundamentals of the grammar gradually from Latin and not before they are met in the context, one gradually begins to realize that the Report is, for all practical purposes, a revival of the so-called Inductive Method. Something new has been added in the way of correlation with other subjects, and special stress on outside reading in English, but the backbone of the thing is the same. One is convinced of this when he reads on page 219:

We recommend in particular that the learning of a formal rule of syntax be postponed until the pupil has encountered the principle involved in his actual reading and has already informally identified the grammatical idea and observed the way in which it is expressed in Latin. A "rule" then becomes a formulation of his own experience that a certain idea is to be expressed in a certain way.

Professor Bennett, in *The Teaching of Latin in the Secondary School*² (Longmans, New York, 1911) has presented serious objections to this method, when carried to an extreme, for both forms and syntax. Briefly, it causes a great deal of floundering and waste of time.

We read also (224-226) that too much emphasis is being placed on questions in formal syntax, and that the common practice of asking such questions *after* the translation of the passage has been given is especially open to objection. To be sure, insistence on the exact quotation of a rule is open to criticism, but I see absolutely no objection to the practice of questioning a pupil about the reasons for his interpretation of a passage of Latin. If an intelligent expression of the linguistic principle is demanded, regardless of the exact wording of that principle as stated in a Grammar, the pupil will learn that translation or interpretation, in order to be accurate and acceptable, must be supported at every point by sound reasoning. Then, too, we have already admitted that the 'pony' is being widely used, and this sort of cross-examination is with some pupils about the last scruple in the way of a most vicious use of such illegitimate helps.

Finally, on pages 223 and 229-231, we are treated to a rather novel way of teaching the declensions and the conjugations. A quotation from page 230 will give a general idea of the method recommended.

The similarities of inflectional endings in the various declensions and conjugations should be emphasized in the initial stages of the work and their differences taken up later. For example, pupils should be able to recognize the accusative singular of a masculine or feminine noun irrespective of the particular declension to which it may belong and to recognize the present and imperfect tenses of all regular conjugations before the four conjugations have been taken up separately.

I think such a treatment of the forms would lead to confusion. I much prefer the suggestion of L. W. P. Lewis in his *Practical Hints on the Teaching of Latin* (Macmillan, 1919), that each declension and conjugation should be learned *in toto* first; then should follow an intensive drill on the single forms; and, finally, as new declensions and conjugations are learned,

these should be compared carefully with those that have preceded.

I could expand much that has been only touched on, and touch on topics whose mention time forbids, but enough, perhaps too much, has been said already. I must add, however, that the good features of the Report are many, and it was only because of a most ominous silence on the part of the classical world regarding any flaws in the Report that a discussion of its possible weaknesses seemed highly desirable. Certainly no thinking person believes that Latin teachers are going to accept the Report *in toto*, without any further question.

In conclusion may I say the following by way of generalizations on the Report?

As far as the Latinist is concerned, the Investigation has discovered no new reason for the study of Latin in the High School. That certainly we did not expect. It may, however, have convinced the world at large of the validity of many of the reasons for the study of Latin which were not generally accepted before.

Much is to be learned from the Report about the actual conditions of Latin studies in Secondary Schools throughout the country, both regarding the type of teaching and concerning the results obtained therefrom. Here, however, some explanation is needed. According to the records of the College Entrance Examination Board, Latin is usually the subject best taught; there are comparatively few failures. According to the statistics of the General Report conditions are very bad. The discrepancy in the two accounts is probably to be accounted for by the difference in the quality of the pupils taking the College Entrance Board examinations and those taking the tests, *et cetera*, of the Investigators. Obviously neither account is entirely correct as a general view of conditions in the whole country.

Many good suggestions and much material help of a pedagogical nature can be obtained from the part of the General Report already published, especially concerning the correlation of Latin with English, which probably is not in some quarters being carried on as extensively as it ought to be.

Concerning the specific recommendations of the Report all teachers of Latin should keep an open mind. They should not be hasty in abandoning methods with which they have achieved success; indeed, they should not abandon any practice before a careful examination of the new methods warrants such a course. Most of the new suggestions were in the minds of the Investigators before the Investigation was begun, and they represent, if you will, the opinions of experienced and successful teachers, but nothing more. Other equally experienced and successful teachers may have quite different suggestions to remedy the situation. I am well aware of the fact that Latin can not afford to have many disagreements within its own ranks at the present time, but a wholesale acceptance of the recommendations presented in the General Report may lead to something much worse. Teachers of Latin should remember the specific requirements of

the standardizing agencies to which they are responsible, and all new suggestions for the betterment of Latin teaching should be weighed in terms of personal confidence in the ability of these suggestions to attain the standards required.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, ROY J. DEFERRARI
WASHINGTON, D. C.

REVIEWS

Vergil's *Aeneid*, Books I-VI, With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. By Arthur W. Roberts and John C. Rolfe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1924). Pp. x + 655.

This edition of the *Aeneid* does not differ materially from its predecessors. It contains the text of the first six books, with all the long quantities marked, and has helps for the understanding and the translation of the same by High School pupils. In addition to this material there is a good summary, in English (226-241), of the story of *Aeneid* 7-12.

The helps offered to the pupil seem, indeed, to the reviewer more than adequate. The inside cover, front and back, shows a map illustrating the voyage of Aeneas. Each book of the *Aeneid* is preceded by an outline, in Latin hexameters, of the book, and by a summary, in English, of two or three pages. Moreover, the verses in each book are grouped into stanzas, or paragraphs, before each of which there is a short summary in English. The reviewer wonders whether the pupil will not lose interest in the story he is translating, since he can thus read it three times, in more or less detail, in English. Again, the same material is covered by a series of questions, in English, which follows each book; most of these are to be answered from the Latin text itself. These questions are, in themselves, to be commended, but to the reviewer they make unnecessary the inclusion of the English summary preceding each book.

The Notes cover 233 pages (245-477), about fifty pages more than the text. They are very complete, leaving little to the imagination of the pupil and not much to the initiative of the instructor. The conscientious pupil will gain much valuable information from them, but the average pupil, in sheer desperation at their number, will omit them altogether, especially since their position, after the text, forces him to make an effort to turn to them.

The Appendix (478-534) contains the material that is usually placed in the Introduction to an edition of the *Aeneid*. We find here I. The Purpose of the *Aeneid* (478-479), II. The Poet and his Works (479-482), III. Vergil in the Middle Ages (483), IV. The Ancient Commentators on Vergil (483-484), V. The Tale of Troy (484-486), VI. The Return from Troy (487), VII. The Story of Carthage (487-488), VIII. The Stars and Constellations in Vergil (488-490), IX. Greek and Roman Mythology (490-508), X. The Reading of Latin Poetry (508-518), XI. The Grammar of Vergil (519-534). Especially commendable are V, which gives, among other details, an excellent account of the double ancestry of the Trojans, and

VIII, which has two maps of the heavens for illustration.

The Vocabulary (537-655) is noticeable because it gives few definitions and because for some words an English derivative is included. Regarding the brevity of the Vocabulary the authors make the statement that the pupil "should always note the derivation and consequent root-meaning, and he should frequently use synonyms of the definitions which are given . . ., choosing as poetical a term as possible". How happy all teachers of Vergil would be if their pupils *could* do that!

The material contained in the Appendix is indexed, briefly, in the Table of Contents (viii-x). There is no index of the material contained in the Notes. This seems to the reviewer a grave mistake, when one considers the huge mass of valuable material to be found there.

The book is attractively printed and bound, and seems not to be marred by typographical errors. It contains eight pertinent illustrations, besides the maps already mentioned.

ALBANY COLLEGE
FOR TEACHERS

L. ANTOINETTE JOHNSON

Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Selections, With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. By Arthur W. Roberts and John C. Rolfe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1925). Pp. v + 116.

The book entitled *Ovid's Metamorphoses, Selections*, by Messrs. Roberts and Rolfe, contains the stories of Deucalion and Pyrrha, Phaethon, The Golden Fleece, Philemon and Baucis, and Atalanta's Race, that is, the selections that meet the requirements for College Entrance Board Examinations for 1926-1928. It is designed that the book shall be used in connection with the edition of Vergil, *Aeneid* I-VI, by the same authors; hence it follows the general plan of that book.

An Introduction (iii-v), on the Life and Writings of Ovid, is followed by the text, with all long quantities marked. As in the Vergil, the text of each Selection is preceded by a short summary, in English, and is divided into stanzas or paragraphs. Before each paragraph there is a summary, in English. There are, however, no sets of questions following each Selection.

The Notes (43-72), which follow the Latin text, are adequate; they are not so abundant as those to the *Aeneid*. In the Notes reference is constantly made to the "Appendix" to be found in the edition of the *Aeneid*.

The Vocabulary (73-116) follows the same general lines as that in the *Aeneid*, in that it has few definitions and contains some English derivatives.

The Ovid is marred by some typographical errors, the worst of which is a note referring to "our addition of the *Aeneid*". The Ovid contains no illustrations, not even a Frontispiece.

ALBANY COLLEGE
FOR TEACHERS

L. ANTOINETTE JOHNSON

THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME FELLOWSHIPS IN THE SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

The American Academy in Rome announces its annual competitions for the Fellowships in Classical Studies. There is one Fellowship for two years and one Fellowship (possibly two) for one year. The annual stipend of each is \$1,250, with residence in the Academy free of charge. There is opportunity for extensive travel, including a trip to Greece. The competitions are open to unmarried men or women who are citizens of the United States. Entries will be received until March 1.

Attention is called to the following general regulations. Persons who desire to compete for one of these Fellowships must fill out a form of application and file it with the Secretary, together with letters of recommendation, not later than March 1. They must submit evidence of attainment in Latin literature, Greek literature, Greek and Roman history and archaeology, and also ability to use German and French. A knowledge of Italian is strongly recommended. They will be required to present published or unpublished papers so as to indicate their fitness to undertake special work in Rome.

The Fellows will be selected by a jury of nine eminent scholars without examination other than the submission of the required papers.

For detailed circular and application blank apply to the undersigned, Executive Secretary of the Academy, 101 Park Avenue, New York City.

ROSCOE GUERNSEY

THE CLASSICAL LEAGUE OF THE LEHIGH VALLEY

The Classical League of the Lehigh Valley held its semiannual meeting at Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., on Saturday, December 5, 1925. The following officers were elected: President, Dr. Horace W. Wright, of Lehigh University; Vice-President, Dr. Henry V. Shelley, of Lafayette College; Secretary-Treasurer, Miss Mary L. Hess, of the Liberty High School, Bethlehem; Executive Committee, Dr. Horace W. Wright, Chairman, Dr. George T. Ettinger, and Miss Mary L. Hess.

Miss Gertrude Lear, of the Liberty High School, Bethlehem, read a paper on Music and Musical Instruments of Ancient Greece and Rome. She said, in part, that the musical development of Greece may be divided historically into four periods: (1) the Mythical or Heroic Period, the age of the wandering minstrel or bard, before 675 B. C., when popular contests in music and poetry began in Sparta; (2) the Classical Period, continuing until the downfall of Greek independence, in 338 B. C.: during this period the practice of music was developed, chiefly at Athens and in its vicinity; (3) the Alexandrian Period, continuing from 325 B. C. until after the Christian era: the older versatile originality now gave way to scientific criticism or mere imitation, at Alexandria; (4) the Roman Period, from the time of Augustus until the Roman Empire was dissolved; during this period the arts of Greece were extensively adopted. Music was blended with poetry, and poetry was felt to require delivery in song for its complete expression. The wandering bards intoned their verses to a meager accompaniment on the lyre or some similar instrument. The epic poetry of Homer

and Hesiod, the lyrics of Sappho and Anacreon, the festal hymns of Simonides and Pindar, the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, and the comedies of Aristophanes were meant to be chanted. Most of the melodies were minor; the singing was done usually by male voices in unison. Music was placed on a scientific basis by Pythagoras. The most common Grecian musical instrument was the lyre. The *kithara* was supposed to have suggested the viola, which led up to the violin. Among the wind instruments were the flutes, double flutes, trumpets, instruments of the clarinet or oboe type, and the water-organ. The sounds on the wind instruments were not always of good quality. Music in Italy became important after the conquest of Greece. The trumpets were more varied, as befit a martial people. The Greeks, not the Romans, were responsible for the music and musical instruments of to-day.

Dr. Henry V. Shelley, of Lafayette College, discussed A Literary Barbarian. He stated that the Athenians of the fifth Century B. C. believed that all other Greek cities were barbarous. In the struggle between Athens and Sparta, Athens was dealt a blow from which she never recovered. Sparta, then Thebes, held sway. Athens ceased temporarily to be the intellectual center of the world. Scholars from all parts of the world flocked to Alexandria, and Athens looked upon the barbarians with a new attitude. In 120 A. D., in the Syrian town of Samosata, was born Lucian. After he failed as a sculptor, he studied rhetoric in Ionia, and as a traveling lecturer visited Syria, Phoenicia, Egypt, and Rome. He lectured and taught rhetoric in Gaul for ten years. Then he devoted his time to the study of philosophy, from which study his gift for satire was developed. He criticized all systems of philosophy, and directed his satire against the gods and the absurdities of paganism. He attacked anything that could not stand the test of truth. His writings had an effect on such modern authors as Jules Verne, Swift, Cervantes, and Cyrano de Bergerac.

In the last paper, entitled Vergil, Dr. George T. Ettinger, of Muhlenberg College, stated that the literature of a period reflects the life of its people.

Augustus saw that he could not ignore the literary tendencies of the times. The first effort of the poets was to please the cultured people and the government. The Augustan Age was the age of culture. Vergil was the most cultured man of his age. Vergil, like Horace, had the best education that his parents could afford. He was sent to Cremona; at Milan he studied philosophy and rhetoric for two years; at Rome he studied oratory, with Augustus, in 53 B. C. From the Greek masters he acquired a knowledge of poetry, rhetoric, science, and philosophy. His vigorous mind portrayed the thoughts of men that would otherwise have been lost to the ages. By gaining the favor of Maecenas and Augustus he was enabled to live a life free from cares. Horace said that Vergil was a pure soul in whom there was no guile. There was in him the nobleness of a gentle and gracious spirit. He refrained from blame, and spoke only when he could praise. He was extremely modest, and the gentle seriousness of his soul permeates all his poems.

As Cicero was an authority and model in Latin prose, so was Vergil in Latin verse. In the *Georgics* Vergil brought love to a subject naturally uninteresting. In the *Aeneid* he became the Homer of his country, as he had been its Theocritus and its Hesiod. He wove together the mythology of Greece and the religion of Rome. The *Aeneid* is the best epic in Latin poetry, though it is not equal to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Its characters are not as rich as those of

Homer, Chaucer, and Shakespeare. The *Aeneid* is the epic of national fortune, the *Iliad* of individual fortune. Though the dress of the *Aeneid* is Greek, its thought is thoroughly Roman.

MARY L. HESS,
Secretary

THE CARE OF CITY STREETS IN ANCIENT ROME

In 1911, an English scholar, Mr. E. G. Hardy, published, through the Oxford University Press, a small volume entitled *Six Roman Laws Translated With Introduction and Notes* (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6, 46). One of these laws was the *Lex Iulia Municipalis* (136-163). I give here Sections 20-45 of this law in Mr. Hardy's rendering:

"As regards the roads which are or shall be within the city of Rome or within one mile of the city of Rome; from the point where continuous habitation ends it shall be the duty of every person, before whose tenement any such road shall run, to maintain that road, at the discretion of the aedile to whom in accordance with this law that portion of the city shall belong. . . .

It shall be the duty of the aediles, whether curule or plebeian, . . . to arrange between themselves, either by agreement or by lot, in which part of the city each of them shall see to the repairing and paving of the public roads within the city of Rome and within one mile of the city of Rome. . . .

Where a road lies or shall lie between a sacred temple or a public building or a public space and a private tenement, it shall be the duty of the aedile <concerned> . . . to contract for the maintenance of one-half of the said road.

If any person, required by this law to maintain a public road in front of his tenement, shall fail to maintain such road to the satisfaction of the aedile concerned, then it shall be the duty of the aedile . . . to contract for the maintenance of such road. Furthermore, the said aedile, not less than ten days before he concludes the contract, shall have it publicly notified in the forum in front of his tribunal, the description of the road to be contracted for, the day fixed for the contract, and the name of the person before whose tenement the road is situated. He shall further cause due notice to be given to the said person and to his agents at their respective houses, of his intention to contract for the road and of the day fixed for the contract. The said contract shall be concluded openly in the forum by means of the urban quaestor or the president of the aerarium for the time being. The sum paid to the contractor for the said road, and the proportion of that sum falling on the several persons whose tenements abut the road, according to the length and breadth of the road in front of their several tenements, the urban quaestor or the president of the aerarium for the time being shall cause to be entered in the public accounts of money owing to the people. For such sums he shall in all good faith make the several parties legally responsible to the person contracting for the maintenance of the said road. If the person so bound over shall, within the next thirty days after he or his agents are notified of the legal obligation, fail to pay the money or to satisfy the party to whom he is made responsible, then such person shall be bound to pay the sum for which he was made responsible, and in addition half the same sum to the party to whom he shall be bound over. . . .

CHARLES KNAPP